

NOTES OF THE  
MARICOPA ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS  
PLANNERS STAKEHOLDERS GROUP

Friday, June 28, 2002  
MAG Office Building, Suite 200 Saguaro Room  
302 North First Avenue, Phoenix

MEMBERS PRESENT

Don Hadder, Sr., Scottsdale  
Matt Holm, Maricopa County  
Joy Mee, Phoenix  
Gary Neiss, El Mirage

Hank Pluster, Chandler  
Ron Short, Glendale  
Phil Testa, Surprise

OTHERS PRESENT

Anubhav Bagley, MAG  
Michelle Green, MAG

Jack Tomasik, MAG

1. MAG Updates

Michelle Green, MAG, presented the updates on the following three categories, State Trust Land Reform, Desert Spaces, Southwest Area Transportation Study.

*State Trust Land Reform* – The Drafting Committee met on June 25 and came to an agreement on an approach to move forward with. The approach is a planning based approach that would see the State Land Department continue to conceptually plan their lands but under a new framework. This approach will involve changes in the current legislation to allow more tools to be used by jurisdictions when negotiating for open space. Currently, the lawyers have formed a group to draft some potential legislation, which will be brought before the group. The drafting committee recognizes the importance of involving the cities and getting their input, which they will do; however, they have also been attempting to keep the drafting committee small and workable. If anyone has any questions regarding this process, they should feel free to contact me. Once there is draft legislation, we will pull together another group to discuss potential issues.

*Desert Spaces* – At the June 2002 Management Committee meeting, the Committee discussed the proposed recommendations to update the MAG Desert Spaces Plan. At the meeting, it was noted that the Plan had been used by many MAG member agencies to support the preservation of open space. The committee expressed that, due to the fact that many MAG member agencies have

their own open space plans under growing smarter, it may be unnecessary for MAG to undertake an update of the Desert Spaces Plan at this time. This action was supported by the Regional Council at its June meeting.

*Southwest Area Transportation Study* – This study is one of the area studies that will feed into the Regional Transportation Plan. Michelle Green attended a workshop for agency input on Wednesday June 26. At this workshop, the consultant presented some preliminary socioeconomic data, broke people up into groups of 4 or 5 so that each group could discuss potential multi-modal solutions to traffic congestion in the west valley. Each group then presented their solutions. It is now in the hands of the consultant to look for the common elements and present those to the group again as well as their own view of what some potential solutions might be. There are similar studies occurring in the Northwest and Southeast/Northern Pinal areas, and attendees of the Planners Stakeholders Group are encouraged to attend.

## 2. Presentation of Draft Information on Job Centers

Jack Tomasik, MAG, presented stating that MAG Regional Development has been working with member agency planners and economic developers to identify job centers throughout the region. Communities themselves identified all the job centers, with the exception of small communities that do not have a point person for planning or economic development. There are 105 job centers for the urban area that resulted from this bottoms-up process. It can be thought of as a composite of locally identified job centers.

There are three uses for the job center information

- 1) MAG Regional Development is working with member agency economic developers in the Greater Phoenix Economic Council's Economic Development Directors Team. As part of the TCSP grant from Federal Highways Administration, we are preparing a regional technical report on economic development. At both the state and regional level, economic development strategies are being prepared. Thus, we are providing member agency economic developers with information on each job center, to be supplemented by telephone interviews, that will help each member agency think through how its job centers could fit with the larger regional strategy, as well as their own economic development strategy or plan.
- 2) The information we are providing about job centers and their 30-minute commute sheds for member agency economic developers is the same as that needed by business prospects, and will be used for economic development marketing.

- 3) MAG will identify regional job centers (based on absolute number of jobs and job densities) that will be used in the Regional Transportation Plan. It is notable that the majority of job centers have great enough employment density to support mass transit; residential density appears to be the issue.

During the presentation of the draft job centers, several obvious errors were noted. Jack Tomasik said that MAG Information Services will review the base data, and that the tables and maps shown in today's meeting will be emailed to the entire Planners Stakeholders Group when finalized. MAG anticipates feedback on this information from member agencies as they review their own job centers in the larger regional context. For example, some member agencies geographically defined job centers broadly, while others defined them to closely match nonresidential land. If any member agency wishes to geographically redefine their job centers, MAG will re-code the GIS shapefile as workload and time allows.

*When you do that portion of the analysis, will you be doing any profiling to determine where people are likely to go? That would make a difference.*

At this point, we have not done that; however, will begin to look at commute sheds for the regional job centers. Currently we only have these maps that show the location of the job centers. It is in draft form but we wanted to let you know that we are working on this and we would welcome any input or comments you may have.

### 3. Town of Carefree General Plan Update

Dennis Zwaggerman, Carefree, presented the general plan for the Town. A copy of his presentation notes are attached for your review.

The Town of Carefree has very strictly defined what an amendment to the General Plan might be because current residents are very proud of the fact that it has built out very much as it was originally planned and would like to see that continue.

#### *Question/Comments*

*What is the Town's biggest issue?*

Traffic is one of the biggest if not the biggest issues for people living in the town. They are concerned about what might happen to the north because although it is public land now, that does not mean that it will remain that way.

*Legally you cannot totally restrict a use from a Town how does the Town deal with that?*

That may be true; however, so far if the Mayor does not support it, it does not happen. The Town has a very strong Mayor and it is very healthy from an economic standpoint.

*Do you have a sewer system?*

Yes, we have the Black Mountain Sewer System; all high density development in the Town is hooked up to this system.

*What about the CIP process?*

The Town and the plan are well funded; the CIP is not part of a public process.

*How does the Town feel about annexation?*

The Town is willing to annex north if it is necessary to protect itself from development. The development has to stop at some point or it will go on and on.

*Really this is a regional issue because we have lots of land available south of the Tonto National Forrest.*

*One good thing about that is that the area is no longer a trade area so there is no immediate or near term danger from there.*

We should remember that although this is true today, its status could change quickly and dramatically. If development does not stop there, then where will it stop?

*Is there water up there?*

Yes, they have water but we also need to remember that Anthem did not have water at one time but now we see what that has developed into.

*Does the County assist?*

The County does respect land use within the planning boundary of a jurisdiction. There is a limit to what the County can do. If a jurisdiction refuses to provide services then a private water and sewer system can be constructed as an alternative.

#### 4. Next Meeting

The July 28, 2002 Planners Stakeholders Group meeting has been cancelled **the next PSG meeting will be held on, August 30, 2002 at 1pm.**